



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/815,769	04/02/2004	Daisuke Yahata	360842009710	9944

7590 12/06/2005

Barry E. Bretschneider  
Morrison & Foerster LLP  
Suite 300  
1650 Tysons Boulevard  
McLean, VA 22102

EXAMINER
----------

JUSKA, CHERYL ANN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1771

DATE MAILED: 12/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/815,769	<b>Applicant(s)</b> YAHATA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Cheryl Juska	<b>Art Unit</b> 1771	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 22-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 22-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>04/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
3. Claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted structural cooperative relationship is the relationship of the claimed crimped yarn to the carpet construction. Is said yarn part of the carpet pile, the base fabric, or another structural component of the carpet?
4. Claims 22-24 are indefinite for claiming the invention in terms of physical properties rather than the chemical or structural features that produce said properties. *Ex parte Slob*, 157 USPQ 172, states, "Claims merely setting forth physical characteristics desired in an article, and not setting forth specific composition which would meet such characteristics, are invalid as vague, indefinite, and functional since they cover any conceivable combination of ingredients either presently existing or which might be discovered in the future and which would impart said desired characteristics." Also, "it is necessary that the product be described with sufficient particularity that it can be identified so that one can determine what will and will not infringe."

Art Unit: 1771

*Benger Labs, Ltd v. R.K. Laros Co.*, 135 USPQ 11, *In re Bridgeford* 149 USPQ 55, *Locklin et al. v. Switzer Bros., Inc.*, 131 USPQ 294. Furthermore, "Reciting the physical and chemical characteristics of the claimed product will not suffice where it is not certain that a sufficient number of characteristics have been recited that the claim reads only on the particular compound which applicant has invented." *Ex parte Siddiqui*, 156 USPQ 426, *Ex parte Davission et al.*, 133 USPQ 400, *Ex parte Fox*, 128 USPQ 157.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

6. Claims 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by JP 2002-180340 A issued to Matsumura et al.

Applicant claims a tufted carpet comprising an aliphatic polyester multifilament crimped yarn, preferably employed in at least a part of the base cloth or primary backing. Said crimped yarn has a melting point of at least 130 C, a crimp elongation rate of 3-35% after being processed with boiling water, and a breaking strength of 1-5 cN/decitex.

Matsumura discloses an aliphatic polyester multifilament crimped yarn suitable for carpets and a carpet produced from said yarn (English abstract). Said crimped yarn has the claimed melting point, crimp elongation, and breaking strength (English abstract and translation, sections [0009] and [0038]). The aliphatic polyester yarn be face yarns and at least part of the

Art Unit: 1771

base fabric (section [0011]). Thus, claims 22-24 are anticipated by the cited Matsumura reference.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over JP 2002-105752 issued to Okawa et al.

Okawa discloses a bulky biodegradable yarn suitable for carpeting (English abstract).

The yarn is a multifilament yarn comprising an aliphatic polyester and has a crimp rate of 5-25% (English abstract and translation, section [0008]).

Although Okawa does not explicitly teach the properties of melting temperature or breaking strength, it is reasonable to presume that said properties are inherent to the invention. Support for said presumption is found in the use of similar materials (i.e., crimped aliphatic polyester multifilament yarn) used to produce the carpet. The burden is upon applicant to prove otherwise. *In re Fitzgerald*, 205 USPQ 495. In the alternative, the claimed properties would obviously have been provided by the process disclosed by Okawa. Note *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 433, footnote 4 (CCPA 1977) as to the providing of this rejection under 35 USC 103 in addition to the rejection made above under 35 USC 102. Therefore, claim 22 is rejected.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. Claims 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the cited Okawa reference.

While Okawa teaches the yarn is for carpets, the reference is silent with respect to tufted carpet and using said yarn in the primary backing. However, said claims are deemed obvious over the reference. Specifically, tufted constructions are conventional in the art of carpets. Applicant is hereby given Official Notice of this fact. Therefore, it would have been readily obvious to employ said yarn in a tufted carpet construction since said constructions are common and commercially successful in the art of carpets. Hence, claim 23 is rejected as being obvious over the cited art.


Regarding claim 24, it would have also been readily obvious to employ said yarn in the primary backing in order to produce a carpet which not only has a biodegradable face but also a biodegradable backing for producing an overall degradable carpet. Therefore, claim 24 is also rejected as being obvious over the cited art.

***Conclusion***

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cheryl Juska whose telephone number is 571-272-1477. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 10am-6pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris can be reached at 571-272-1478. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1771

11. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



CHERYLA JUSKA  
PRIMARY EXAMINER